

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/424,500

Applicant(s)

SATO, AKIRA

Examiner

Matthew S. Smith

Art Unit

2825

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Matthew S. Smith.

(3)_____.

(2) Ben Halpern.

(4)_____.

Date of Interview: 10 September 2002 .

Type: a)☐ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference

c)☒ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant 2)☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes e)☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____ .

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 12 and 15 .

Identification of prior art discussed: Japanese references 410, 282 and 268 .

Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was reached. g)☒ was not reached. h)☐ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet .

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i)☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant discussed their position on the amendment recently filed and the examiner reviewed the prior art in light of the wording of the amendment. The examiner detailed that the one reference does teach removing the support pins prior to setting or curing of the resin. However, the issue of the pressure and stress on the lead frame may be a question as to the reading of the prior art on the claims. The examiner will review the prior art and translations if any and should there be language which would overcome the prior art(should it be found to continue to read on the claims) the examiner will solicit an amendment to incorporate such language in an examiner's amendment..